

December 2005

Accountability Update

Overview

In 2004, the legislature and governor enacted House Bill 3103, revising the responsibilities of the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Section 11 of the bill directed the board to “establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals in higher education.”

Later in 2004, the HECB adopted the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*. The master plan establishes two goals and outlines 11 strategic policy initiatives related to the goals. One of the 11 strategic policy initiatives – “Promoting student success through greater accountability” articulates the view that, “By redesigning the state’s higher education accountability system, the state can identify and address the strengths and weaknesses at the institution, sector, and state levels to better promote student success.”

The strategic master plan also declares, “[A] strong accountability system must ensure that efficiency, equity, and effectiveness are defined in measurable terms and that statewide and institutional policies are created, modified, or discontinued based on an analysis of accountability results.”

HECB Accountability Framework

Urged on by the legislature and in accordance with its own plans, the HECB adopted an accountability framework at its April, 2005 meeting. That accountability framework consists of four main components:

- A context section
- Performance indicators common to all institutions (one set of indicators for public baccalaureate institutions, and a separate set of indicators for the two-year college system)
- Baccalaureate institution-specific performance indicators relating to the unique mission of particular campuses
- A timeline for linking the biennial budget and accountability reporting cycles

Performance targets on the established indicators for the baccalaureate institutions are to be approved by the HECB. Campus-level performance targets for the two-year institutions are to be set by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC); statewide performance targets for the two-year system as a whole are to be set by the SBCTC, with HECB approval. The institutions will use a three-year average to calculate baseline performance on the indicators. The targets, according to the HECB's accountability framework, will meet or exceed the baseline. The two-year colleges base their targets on funding and will continue this method.

The framework envisions an overall evaluation of the accountability framework every four years, timed to coincide with the development of the strategic master plan.

2005-07 Biennial Budget

In May 2005, with passage of the operating budget, another layer of accountability measures for the four-year institutions was added. The institutions, the OFM, and HECB are required to establish performance targets on six performance measures described in the budget. The budget also requires performance targets on defined indicators at the two-year institutions. But the indicators referenced in the budget for the two-year campuses were already contained within the accountability framework previously adopted by the HECB.

Related Provisions

The HECB is required to report every two years on the performance of the institutions in relation to the indicators spelled out as part of the accountability system. The HECB adopted its most recent accountability report in January, 2005. The next biennial accountability report up for adoption by the HECB will be presented by the end of 2006.

The HECB is required to annually review the actual achievements of the institutions. Institutions are required to annually report data to the HECB permitting such review of actual achievements on accountability indicators. The review by the HECB of actual achievements of the institutions for the 2004-05 academic year will occur following submission of data by the institutions. This data has been requested by HECB staff; some data has already been received.

HECB Role

HECB staff have held discussions with representatives of the baccalaureate institutions. Each institution has proposed a rationale for each of the indicators applicable to its institution. Specifically, the institutions have determined whether their own past performance, results for a group of peer institutions, or some other basis of comparison, is most appropriate for each

indicator. The institutions have also proposed goals (or targets) for their own institutional results on each relevant indicator. The indicators from the budget require six-year targets. The HECB accountability framework indicators require only two-year targets.

HECB staff have also discussed with SBCTC staff the impact of these provisions in the two-year sector. The SBCTC board is expected to approve two-year targets on the defined performance indicators at its December, 2005 meeting.

HECB staff will present the proposed performance targets to the HECB at the December, 2005 board meeting, with adoption scheduled for January, 2006.

December 2005

Accountability in Higher Education in Washington

State Legislative/Administrative History

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1986 | HECB highlights issue of accountability in master plan. |
| 1987 | Budget provision calls on HECB and SBCTC to report to the Legislature concerning a number of accountability/assessment measures. |
| 1995 | <p>Budget directs institutions to report to HECB on strategies to meet increasing demands for efficiency, focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty contact• Time-to-degree/certificate• Graduation rates• Increasing number of degrees per instructional faculty |
| 1996 | HECB publishes Accountability Report, containing state and institutional results on numerous indicators in relation to goals of the board. |
| 1997 | <p>Budget establishes requirement for performance goals in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Graduation efficiency index (95% freshmen/90% transfer)• Student retention (95% research/90% comprehensive)• Five-year graduation rates (65% research/55% comprehensive)• Faculty productivity• A campus-specific accountability measure <p>Two percent of non-instructional funding (\$10.7 million) is withheld from baccalaureate institutions, placed in reserve, to be released upon certification by HECB that institutions have met performance targets. HECB reviews and approves institutions' plans, recommends release of all funds for first year of budget. All reserve funds are released in the first year.</p> |

Two-year colleges have similar framework of performance goals (wages for vocational graduates, academic transfer rate increases, core course completion, graduation efficiency index). Partial funding is withheld in reserve

1998 HECB publishes report entitled, “Performance Funding and Accountability,” reporting that two-thirds of goals (39 of 58 separate measures) were met or exceeded. The HECB recommends release of 77% of withheld funds, creation of incentive pool of performance funds available through competitive grants. The report encourages new assessment projects in quantitative skills and technology literacy.

[For the biennium, \$9.1 million was eventually released; \$1.5 million was not released to institutions, and lapsed to the Education Savings Account.]

1999 Budget does not withhold funds. Baccalaureate institutions are directed to report to HECB on annual progress toward goals (from 1997-99 budget).

Fall Accountability Forum participants agreed to emphasize student learning outcomes (writing, information and technology literacy, quantitative reasoning)

2000 HB 2375 directs public baccalaureates to define information and technology literacy, develop strategies for measuring achievement, and report to Legislature by January, 2002 on feasibility and implementation plans.

HECB publishes report entitled, “Performance Accountability,” recommends against budgetary penalties linked to performance measures, and recommends re-evaluating goals set by Legislature in 97-99 budget.

2001 Budget does not include indicators or targets; directs HECB to set targets and requires institutions to prepare accountability plans to achieve measurable and specific improvement. HECB delegates to institutions responsibility for setting meaningful targets

2003 HECB reviews targets, publishes “Higher Education Accountability Plans” report, and recommends changing August deadline for accountability plans since data are not available until October.

2004 HB 3103 is adopted, revising HECB responsibilities.

- HECB “shall establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals”

2005-07
Budget Base funding increases approved for institutions. Institutions are required to “show demonstrable progress” toward specified six-year goals.

- Proportion of students who graduate within 125% of credits required
- Proportion of degrees awarded to Pell grant recipients
- Freshman retention
- National ranking for federal research grants
- Job placement or graduate school acceptance rates
- Number of accredited programs

* Also included in budget as performance indicators.

HECB DEGREES AWARDED INDICATOR

Targets Proposed by Institutions for 2006-07 Academic Year

	Baseline* Associate Degrees	Target** Associate Degrees	Baseline* Bachelor's Degrees	Target** Bachelor's Degrees	Baseline* Grad/Prof Degrees	Target** Grad/Prof Degrees
CTC system associate degrees	21,696	--				
Public associate academic degrees	14,152	--				
Public associate technical degrees	7,544	--				
Private associate degrees	1,292	912**				
State Total	22,988					
UW Seattle			7,083	7,150	3,478	3,500
UW Bothell			527	575	94	100
UW Tacoma			668	725	125	150
WSU			4,166	4,170	1,076	1,090
CWU			2,031	2,100	203	203
EWU			1,742	1,800	556	579
TESC			1,152	1,152	93	93
WWU			2,813	2,913	364	364
Public 4-year Total			20,182	20,585	5,989	6,079
Private 4-year			6,879	6,720**	4,495	4,644**
State Total			27,061	27,305	10,484	10,723
HECB Interim target 06-07 (12/04 budget recs rept)		22,800 (96% public)		28,000 (76% public – 21,280)		10,800 (57% public – 6,156)
Master Plan target 09-10		27,000		30,000		11,500
Master Plan public share 09-10		25,800		22,800		6,555
Master Plan private share 09-10		1,200		7,200		4,945

*Baselines reflect the average over the most recent three years for which data are available. From 2003-04 to 2004-05, private bachelor's degree production jumped 11.6% and private graduate degree production rose 9%. Associate degree awards dropped in 2004-05 in both the public and private sectors from 2003-04.

**Targets are for the 2006-07 academic year. Private sector targets assume fixed percentage of total identified in 2004 Strategic Master Plan.



Border signifies proposed goals below baseline performance. (Accountability framework adopted by HECB stipulates that goals are to meet or exceed baseline performance.)

HECB COMMON BACCALAUREATE INDICATORS

Goals Proposed by Institutions for 2006-07 Academic Year

	UW Seattle	UW Bothell	UW Tacoma	WSU	CWU	EWU	TESC	WWU
Baseline high demand* 4-year degrees	2,121	165	81	582	43	337	0	--
Target high demand 4-year degrees	2,175	175	100	616	52	405	0	--
Baseline 6-yr graduation rate**	71.0%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	61.2%	50.9%	46.2%	50.4%	61.6%
Target 6-yr graduation rate	73%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	62%	51%	52%	50%	62%
Baseline 3-yr graduation*** rate	70.6%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	63.4%	73.7%	60.7%	71.8%	60.8%
Target 3-year graduation rate	74%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	64%	75%	62%	73%	61%
Baseline 4 th year persistence rate***	10.3%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	17.7%	27.5%	16.7%	5.6%	14.3%
Target 4 th year persistence rate	10%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	17%	28%	20%	5%	15%
Baseline Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) – (non-transfer)	0.899	0.883	0.846	0.901	0.837	0.804	0.900	0.913
Target GEI (non-transfer)	0.90	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.84	0.82	0.90	0.91
Baseline GEI (transfer)	0.820	0.868	0.864	0.858	0.790	0.697	0.883	0.838
Target GEI (transfer)	0.82	0.87	0.87	0.86	0.79	0.71	0.88	0.84

*“High demand” areas, defined by the HECB in *State and Regional Needs Assessment* (Nov. 2005), are computer science, engineering, software engineering, architecture and health care occupations.

Washington public and private baccalaureate institutions had a 6-year graduation rate of 63% in 2004. This rate is up from 61% ten years earlier. **The 2004 graduation rate places Washington among the top 5 states in the country for this measure, according to *Measuring Up, 2004*, published by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. The top 5 states had an average graduation rate of 64%.

***For students transferring from a Washington community college



Border signifies proposed goals below baseline performance. (Accountability framework adopted by HECB stipulates that goals are to meet or exceed baseline performance.)

HECB ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK and BUDGET INDICATORS

Targets Proposed by Community and Technical College System for 2006-07 Academic Year

	Technical associate degrees awarded	Academic associate degrees awarded	Students prepared for transfer*	Students prepared for work*	Students gaining basic skills*
Baseline	7,544	14,152	17,436	23,394	20,950
Target** recommended to SBCTC	--	--	17,800	23,500	21,809
Target as % of base			102.1%	100.5%	104.1%

*Indicator is both an indicator within the HECB-adopted accountability framework and in the 2005-07 operating budget. However, budget language requires 6-year targets; HECB indicators use 2-year targets.

**Targets are recommendations to the SBCTC board contained in a draft resolution prepared by SBCTC staff for consideration by the board. SBCTC action not yet known.

Definitions

Baseline – For degrees awarded, baselines are calculated using the average for the most recent three completed academic years. For other indicators, baselines are the performance results reported by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for the 2004-05 academic year.

Prepared for Transfer – Students who have earned an associate degree or have earned 45 college-level academic credits with a GPA of at least 2.0, including completion of core requirements typically completed by freshmen at a baccalaureate institution.

Prepared for Work – Students who have completed a vocational program (degree, certificate, or other program), including achievement of industry skill standards, or who have completed 45 vocational college-level credits with a GPA of at least 2.0.

Gaining Basic Skills – The proportion of students enrolled in a basic skills program (English as a Second Language, Adult Basic Education, or high school diploma equivalency, that is, GED) who gain one competency level in at least one subject area during the year.

BUDGET MEASURES –Targets Proposed by Institutions (2010-11 AY)

	UW	WSU	CWU	EWU	TESC	WWU
Baseline* % graduating w/in 125% of required credits	92.1%	91.6%	85.7%	78%	96.8%	94.9%
Target** % graduating within 125% of required credits	93%	93%	87%	79% 06-7 81% 08-9 83% 10-11 AY	97%	95%
Baseline % UG degrees to Pell grant recipients	29.4%	36.5%	39%	49%	41.9%	32.6%
Target UG degrees to Pell grant recipients	30%	37%	38%	49%	42%	33%
Baseline freshmen retention***	91.5%	84.5%	78.5%	75.5%	71.9%	83.9%
Target freshmen retention	93%	85%	80%	76% 06-7 78% 08-9 81% 10- 11	72%	84%
Baseline job placement or grad schl enrollment	24% earn grad degree w/in 5 yrs	82.3% employed; 22.9% grad school	70.7% employed; 27.3% grad school	90% employed	90.3% employed or grad school	77.1% employed; 14.5% grad school
Target job placement or grad schl enroll	25% earn grad degree w/in 5 yrs	82% employed; 22% grad school	60% employed; 30% grad school	90% employed	90% employed or grad school	77% employed; 14% grad school
Baseline top 20 programs	14.5	2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Target top 20 programs	17	2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseline federal research rank	2 nd overall (1 st public)	109 th overall (72 nd public)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Target federal research rank	1 st public	99 th overall (73 rd public)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseline programs accredited	NA	NA	8	56 of 73 programs (77%)	NA	38 of 46 programs (83%)
Target programs accredited	NA	NA	8	56 programs (77%)	NA	41 programs (90%)

*Baselines are calculated by averaging the result for the three (when three are available) most recent data points available for the indicator, following the methodology for HECB accountability framework.

**Targets relate to 2010-11 academic year. EWU also includes interim targets for two indicators.

***According to the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (*Measuring Up, 2004*), **Washington's freshmen retention rate in 2004 was 83%, up from 80% ten years earlier. The 2004 rate places Washington among the top 5 states, which averaged 84%.**